

- **Title and abstract**
  - Does the title clearly reflect the content of the article? [] Yes, [] No (please explain), [] I don't know
  - Does the abstract present the main findings of the study? [] Yes, [] No (please explain), [] I don't know
- **Introduction**
  - Are the research questions/hypotheses/predictions clearly presented? [] Yes, [] No (please explain), [] I don't know
  - Does the introduction build on relevant research in the field? [] Yes, [] No (please explain), [] I don't know
- **Materials and methods**
  - Are the methods and analyses sufficiently detailed to allow replication by other researchers? [] Yes, [] No (please explain), [] I don't know
  - Are the methods and statistical analyses appropriate and well described? [] Yes, [] No (please explain), [] I don't know
- **Results**
  - In the case of negative results, is there a statistical power analysis (or an adequate Bayesian analysis or equivalence testing)? [] Yes, [] No (not applicable), [] I don't know
  - Are the results described and interpreted correctly? [] Yes, [] No (please explain), [] I don't know
- **Discussion**
  - Have the authors appropriately emphasized the strengths and limitations of their study/theory/methods/argument? [] Yes, [] No (please explain), [] I don't know
  - Are the conclusions adequately supported by the results (without overstating the implications of the findings)? [] Yes, [] No (please explain), [] I don't know
- **Comments & Suggestions**

In general, this is a well-written manuscript that provides a comprehensive description of the SCA application to landscape pattern simulations, based on the Chouca package. The examples used in the manuscript effectively demonstrate the utility of the package in ecological modelling.

My primary suggestion for improvement would be to include a more detailed comparison with other existing tools (e.g., CellPyLib for Python) in the discussion. This would more distinctly highlight Chouca's unique features and its advantages and disadvantages.